History 3616
Europe 1919-1945
Dr. Eli Rubin, PhD
Western Michigan University
Summer I Semester 2011
9 am – 11:30 am T-Th
Dunbar 3209

Course Syllabus

Figure 1: Soviet Troops Above the Reichstag, May 2 1945

Contents:

I. Introduction
II. Course Objectives
III. Class and Grading Structure
IV: Disclaimers
V: Schedule of Lectures and Assignments

Appendix One: Rubric for Papers
Appendix Two: Checklist for Writing Papers
Appendix Three: Guide to Chicago Style of Citation

Office: 4418 Friedmann Hall
E-mail: eli.rubin@wmich.edu
Office phone: 269-387-4646
Office hours: Wed, 11:30-1:30 pm or by appointment.

I. Introduction

On May 2, 1945, the last shots of World War Two were fired as the German Grand Admiral Doenitz surrendered to the American General Eisenhower. Two days earlier, Adolf Hitler had shot himself in the head and his bride, Eva Braun, killed herself with a poison capsule inside his underground bunker as Soviet troops closed in overhead. Europe lay in ruins. Entire cities had been destroyed. More than 10 million Germans had been killed, more than 20 million Russians, and millions of other people from Spain to Estonia were gone.

More than the physical devastation was perhaps the moral devastation to be reckoned with: more than 6 million Jews, and several hundreds of thousands of other "undesirables" such as gypsies, the mentally retarded and homosexuals, had been systematically fed through "death factories" designed to kill with maximum speed and efficiency by the Nazis. This was the Holocaust. The War also challenged the moral limits of the allies as well; as many as half of all German girls and women may have been raped by Soviet troops in eastern Germany; a Soviet submarine sank a German cruise ship carrying 5,000 German women and small children back to Germany from Poland, almost all of whom quickly died in the icy seas; and in March of 1945, after the war was all but won, the British Royal Air Force (RAF) dropped unthinkable amounts of napalm bombs on the city of Dresden, igniting an inferno that killed more than 100,000 civilians in one night, most of them women and children.

How did it come to this? At the end of World War One, in 1918, the American President Woodrow Wilson said it had been the "war to end all wars." New men, committed to democracy, capitalism, human rights, freedom of speech and all the attributes we consider essential to freedom, took the stage as the older generation of Kings, Emperors, generals, and aristocrats, blamed for starting World War One, faded away. It was a time of optimism.

And yet, instead of resulting in democracy, capitalism, and human rights, this era gave way to fascism, communism, militarism, deadly violent racism and nationalism, and a nightmare of violence the world will hopefully never see again

Figure 2: Italian Dictator Benito Mussolini

II. Course Objectives

Two types of knowledge: There are two main types of knowledge that you will gain from this course, and which you will be responsible for demonstrating.

1. Factual Knowledge.
2. Scholarly Ability

"Factual knowledge" means not just being able to identify names, dates, locations, events, etc., but being able to place them within a *narrative context*. For example, can you explain the collapse of the German eastern front in World War Two as a clear causal chain of events: when "X" happened, this caused "Y" to happen, which led to "Z."

"Scholarly ability" means the whole range of skills you deploy to demonstrate your factual knowledge, and includes your ability to write effectively, use correct forms of citation, and respond thoughtfully to the reading material. This is a *Writing Intensive* class. That means you are expected to write a great deal and to do so at a *very high level*. Writing is the way in which we most effectively communicate knowledge and ideals, and all that "scholars" really do is take the communication of knowledge and arguments to a higher level of exactness. There are specific goals upon which you will be evaluated under each of these two rubrics:

In terms of **factual knowledge** by the end of this course you should be able to:

1. Explain the aftereffects of the First World War on Europe
2. Explain the causes and means of the rise of Fascism in Italy
3. Identify the various offshoots of Fascism in interwar Europe
4. Identify the various new artistic and intellectual movements in painting, sculpture, architecture, design, and music during the 1920s.
5. Explain the collapse of the Weimar Republic and the rise of Nazism.
6. Explain the inner workings of the Third Reich.
7. Explain the causes of the Second World War in Europe, especially the German invasion of the Soviet Union.
8. Explain the causes of, the stages of, and the individuals and organizations involved in the Holocaust.
9. Explain the success and subsequent failure of German military strategy during World War Two.
10. Explain the consequences for Germans in the aftermath of military and political collapse.

In terms of **scholarly ability** by the end of this course you should be able to:

1. Write with a clear thesis that is supported throughout your paper with evidence.
2. Make a clear distinction between primary and secondary sources and treat them in the proper way.
3. Write introductions and conclusions that are free of fluff, extraneous narrative, and which contain a clear thesis and outline of the body of the paper.
4. Understand and properly use Chicago Manual of Style Citation.
5. Come to class having done the readings and answered the reading questions ahead of time.

III. Class and Grading Structure

A. **Scoring:** Your grade in this course is based on your score in five areas. Each area is worth a total of 100 points. Your total points are doubled to determine your percentage out of 1000. So, for example, if you end the semester with 450 points, 450 x 2 = 900, which is a 90%, or, according to the grading scale of Western Michigan University, a BA.

B. **Scoring categories:** The five areas are comprised of two papers, a written final take home exam, and class participation. More information on how your class participation score is generated follows.

C. **Lectures vs. discussions:** Class is usually divided into two segments: a lecture and a discussion. Normally, reading questions are distributed the weekend before the readings are discussed. You are required to attend all classes, and attendance will be taken at the beginning of each class. You are allowed one unexcused absence during the course of the semester.

D. **Class participation grade:** You are graded differently for lectures and discussions:

1. You can earn a maximum of 4 points for each lecture. You must show up on time, and behave respectfully during lecture. This means no laptops or other electronic or wireless devices unless I give you permission. No sleeping, talking, coming in late, or other distracting behavior. Violating this will result in a reduction or complete loss of points for that day.

2. You can earn a maximum of 4 points per discussion. To reach this potential, you must come on time and exhibit good behavior; you must also bring your reading materials and have them out so I know you have them, you must bring your answers to the discussion questions and have these out and visible, and you must participate in the discussions actively.

E. **Extensions and unexpected circumstances:** Occasionally, there are legitimate reasons why you may not be able finish an assignment. If this happens, you are advised to contact me and work out an alternate arrangement.

F. **Extra Credit:** There may be an opportunity for extra credit during the course of the semester, but this is not a guarantee.

IV. Standard Disclaimers

Academic Honesty:

You are responsible for making yourself aware of and understanding the policies and procedures in the *Undergraduate Catalog* (pp. 274-275) that pertain to Academic Integrity. These policies include cheating, fabrication, falsification and forgery, multiple submission, plagiarism, complicity and computer misuse. If there is reason to believe you have been involved in academic dishonesty, you will be referred to the Office of Student Conduct. You will be given the opportunity to review the charge(s). If you believe you are not responsible, you will have the opportunity for a hearing. You should consult with me if you are uncertain about an issue of academic honesty prior to the submission of an assignment or test.

Electronic Mail:

The only email address that should be used for communication between WMU students and WMU faculty and staff is the email address associated with a BroncoNet ID. This email address typically takes the form "firstname.middleinitial.lastname@wmich.edu." An example is buster.h.bronco@wmich.edu. Students cannot automatically forward email from this address to other addresses. Students can access this email account or get instructions for obtaining a BroncoNet ID at GoWMU.wmich.edu.

Figure 3: Marchel Duchamps Urinal, a landmark of Dadaist Art in the 1920s

V. Schedule of Lectures and Assignments

You have five required readings for this course:

Alexander De Grand, *Italian Fascism*
Jan Gross, *Neighbors*
Marc Bloch, *Strange Defeat*
Jay Diamondberg, ed., *Weimar Republic Sourcebook*
Anonymous: *A Woman in Berlin*
Christopher Browning, *Ordinary Men*

These are all available at the WMU bookstore as well as online.

Week One

Tuesday, May 10

LECTURE: Course Introduction, Legacy of World War One in Europe, founding of Weimar Republic

LECTURE: Communism

Thursday, May 12

LECTURE: Fascism

READING/DISCUSSION: De Grand, *Italian Fascism* Preface and Part One (to page 37); *Weimar Republic Sourcebook* ("Spartacus Manifesto"; "The Meaning and Idea of the Revolution"; Founding Manifesto of the Communist Party of Germany; Thälmann, "The SPD and NSDAP are Twins")

Week Two

Tuesday, May 17

LECTURE: Weimar Politics

Reading/Discussion: *Weimar Republic Sourcebook* excerpts (German Center Party Program; Social Democratic Party Program; German People's Party Program; Rosenberg, "The Russian Jewish Revolution"; German Workers' Party Twenty Five Points; Goebbels, "National Socialism or Bolshevism"; Hitler, *Mein Kampf*; Goebbels, "Why Are We Enemies of the Jews?")

ACTIVITY: Weimar speed dating

Thursday, May 19

LECTURE: Weimar Art and Culture

READING/DISCUSSION: *Weimar Republic Sourcebook* ("This is the New Woman"; Taut, "A Program for Architecture"; Breuer "Metal Furniture and Modern Spatiality"; Lihotzky, "Rationalization in the Household"; Steinicke "A Visit to a New Apartment"; Rathaus, "Charleston"; Goll, "The Negroes are conquering Europe"; Wehrling, "Berlin is becoming a whore")

ACTIVITY: Fun with Weimar Art

RECEIVE FIRST WRITING ASSIGNMENT

Week Three

Tuesday, May 24

LECTURE: Germany, France and Italy and the Rise of Nazism

READING/DISCUSSION: De Grand, *Italian Fascism* Part Two, to p. 102

Thursday, May 26

LECTURE: Inside the Third Reich

READING/DISCUSSION: TBD

Week Four

Tuesday, May 31

LECTURE: World War Two, Pt. 1

READING/DISCUSSION: Bloch, *Strange Defeat* (entire book)

Thursday, June 2

LECTURE: World War Two, Pt. 2

READING/DISCUSSION: Browning, *Ordinary Men*, everything up to the end of Chapter 11

FIRST WRITING ASSIGNMENT DUE; RECEIVE SECOND WRITING ASSIGNMENT

Week Five

Tuesday, June 7

LECTURE: The Holocaust, Pt. 1

READING/DISCUSSION: Browning, *Ordinary Men*, remainder of book (including afterword)

Thursday, June 9

LECTURE: The Holocaust, Pt. 2

READING/DISCUSSION: Gross, *Neighbors* (Entire Book)

Week Six

Tuesday, June 14

LECTURE: Resistance and Revenge

READING/DISCUSSION: Anonymous, *A Woman in Berlin* (entire book)

Thursday, June 16

LECTURE: In a Shattered World: the Immediate Postwar Era

READING/DISCUSSION: Excerpt from Klemperer, *Diaries* and Speer, *Memoirs*. (will be available on e-learning and will be e-mailed)

Week Seven

Tuesday, June 21

LECTURE: Open

READING/DISCUSSION: study session for final exam

Thursday, June 23

FILM VIEWING: Choice of *Downfall*, *Stalingrad*, *Conspiracy*, *Schindler's List*, *The Pianist*

SECOND WRITING ASSIGNMENT DUE AT END OF CLASS; RECEIVE TAKE-HOME FINAL.

Week Eight

Tuesday June 28th

TAKE HOME FINAL EXAMS DUE BY MIDNIGHT (E-MAIL). DO NOT SUBMIT IN .WPS!

APPENDIX ONE: GRADING RUBRIC

On your papers and tests, you are graded using a point system. You start off, in essence, with 100 points, and we then deduct points for various problems. This does not remove all subjectivity from the process, but hopefully gives you a better idea of what to aim for and to expect. As a general rule, I will subtract either 10, 5, 2 or 1 points depending on the nature of the issue.

Papers are expected to be written with an introduction, a main body, and a conclusion. The introduction should contain a thesis statement and a preview of the 2-4 main points that you will use to back up your thesis. The body should be structured around expanding those 2-4 main points. The conclusion should recap those same points and the thesis. It is not a bad idea to use subheadings to make it very clear to us what your main points are.

Your thesis should be a clear answer to the question. You can come up with any kind of unconventional answer if you feel like being creative but it must clearly answer the question in some way.

Common errors and deductions for papers:

1. Missing or inadequate introduction or conclusion = -5
2. Paper length too short = -10 (for each page it is short)
3. Paper turned in too late = -10 (for each day late)
4. Unclear or inaccurate thesis = -2
5. Not using enough evidence -2/-5
6. Over-using evidence (for example, filling an entire page with text quotation to avoid having to write your own thoughts) -2/-5
7. Glaring historical inaccuracies (e.g. Britain is in Asia) -2
8. Minor historical inaccuracies (Germany was unified in the 1880s, not 1870s) -1
9. Misspellings and other grammatical problems, if meaning of sentence or paragraph is clear = -1
10. Misspellings and other grammatical problems, if these prevent us from understanding meaning of sentence or paragraph = -2
11. Missing citation = -2 / -10 if no citations throughout

There will inevitably be other issues that arise, these are just the most common.

APPENDIX TWO: CHECKLIST FOR PAPERS

Title:

–have you spelled my name correctly?

–have you included your name?

–have you stapled your paper?

Introduction

–have you addressed the entire question directly?

–have you clearly stated your answer to the question, which is your thesis?

–have you clearly laid out what your supporting evidence for your thesis/answer will be?

–Is there extraneous information and/or language (i.e., "fluff")? Examples include statements that are:

- exaggerated ("the Holocaust was the most horrible thing ever to happen in the history of the universe")

-over-generalized ("Germans just hated Jews and just wanted them all to die"),

-truisms ("all's well that ends well")

-inappropriate contemporary or personal comparisons or tie-ins ("When I was five, my friends teased me, which is just how Jews felt in Germany")

-Inappropriately emotional or over-descriptive ("Germany was a whirling, raging, seething, boiling mass of terrifying horror like a beast with dripping fangs")

-Weak and ambiguous ("the Holocaust was probably caused by some different things and some other things too but it was also caused by some stuff")

-Too informal, slangy, or profane ("The stuff going on back in the day was totally messed up, like.")

–Is there a premature presentation of evidence in the introduction? (Evidence needs to be in the body of the paper.)

–Please, do not use the dictionary, or any dictionary, as a source, especially of filler.

Body of paper

–Are there three (can sometimes be two or four) clearly defined supporting points of evidence? Have you used subheadings to make clear your three supporting points? (Subheadings are required)

–Are the supporting points of evidence clearly linked to your answer/thesis? Do they in fact support your answer/thesis?

–Does each paragraph have a purpose? Is it clearly linked to the point of evidence it is supporting?

–Are there paragraphs which do not fit where they are, do not support whichever evidentiary point they are supposed to, or are repetitive?

–Have you used the evidence (either primary or secondary sources) in a way appropriate to answering your question?

–Have you used quotations incorrectly, such as:

-Giving a quote without explaining in the line preceding it who said it and why it is important

-Quoting a secondary source which is not evidence and which does not need to be quoted directly, but can be paraphrased

-Failing to put lengthy quotations in single-spaced, indented, block form

–Have you used proper Chicago-style citation form? (see attached guide on citations)

–Are you simply re-narrating a topic, rather than analyzing it?

–Have you considered what the opposing or alternative viewpoint might be to your thesis, laid that out, given it due credit and then explained why your answer makes more sense?

–Are you making common and repeated grammatical mistakes, such as:

–misuse of apostrophes. It's = "it is," its = a possessive; centuries like 1800s or decades like 70s do not use an apostrophe; the plural of Nazi is Nazis, not Nazi's, which is the possessive of one Nazi, and the possessive of more than one Nazi is Nazis'

–Incomplete sentences. If you are editing your paper after a first draft, which you should, make sure your changes are complete—don't start changing a sentence and then forget to check whether it is still complete.

–Capitalization. Proper nouns, generally, are the only things capitalized. Some things like anti-semite vs. anti-Semite are okay either way. However, your word processing program is usually correct; if it gives a red or green squiggle underneath, you can be sure it will probably get deducted by me.

–Passive tense. Sometimes, it is unavoidable, especially when you really just have no idea who or what caused something. But if you have an idea who or what did an action, always write in the accusative (x did y, not y was done)

–Italicizing book titles in your text, as well as in the footnotes.

<u>Conclusion</u>

–Have you checked to see if your restated thesis is actually the same as what was put in the introduction? Often you will have to go back and change what you said in the intro to make it match the conclusion.

–Does your conclusion sum up all the evidence you presented and restate your answer to the question?

–Your conclusion, like your introduction, is not the place to introduce new material or evidence of any kind. Does it?

–Your conclusion should avoid hackneyed phrasing like "all in all" or "to sum up"—that is pure high school. Is anything like this in your conclusion?

APPENDIX THREE: CHICAGO MANUAL OF STYLE CITATION

Citation guide—Chicago style of citation (for word – Mac OS. Go to word help on PCs for instructions on inserting footnotes).

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING WEB SITES ALSO PROVIDE HELPFUL INSTRUCTION ON HOW TO CITE USING CHICAGO STYLE. YOU MAY ALSO PURCHASE THE CHICAGO MANUAL OF STYLE OR A SIMILAR, LESS EXPENSIVE BOOK, KATE TURABIAN'S *A MANUAL FOR WRITERS*.

http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools_citationguide.html

http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/717/01/

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m_ePYMR5nJU&feature=related

The Basic Rule of Citations:

Citations give the reader the ability to find the same source you used, with maximum efficiency and minimum text.

1. For the first time you cite a book, you give the full form citation in the footnote. At the end of the sentence in which the evidence appears, go to "insert" and then "footnote." Automatically, a numbered footnote will appear at the bottom of your page. The full form for a book looks like this:

Author name (First, Last), *Full Book Title*, (City of Publication: Name of Press), Year

At the end of that info, you put a comma and then the page number, followed by a period. So, to cite information from page 11 of Mendes-Flohr's *German Jews: A Dual Identity*, the full form citation will look like this:

Paul Mendes-Flohr, *German Jews: A Dual Identity*, (New Haven: Yale University Press), 1999, 11.

2. If you cite the same book in the next footnote, instead of writing the author or title again, you simply write the abbreviation "Ibid." (Which is short for Ibidem, Latin for "same as before"). So, if the next piece of evidence you cite comes from the same book by Mendes-Flohr, and the same page (page 11) you go to "insert" and then "footnote" and then at the bottom, when a number 2 automatically pops up with a flashing cursor at the bottom of the page:

Ibid.

If the citation comes from the same book, but a different page in that book (say, page 15), you write "Ibid." followed by the page number, like this:

Ibid., 15.

This goes for any time you cite consecutively, no matter how many times you cite something consecutively.

3. If you cite a book in full form, and then your second citation is a different book, you give the full form citation of that second book.

The first time you cite any work, you give the full form citation of that work.

4. If you cite one work for the first time, giving its full form, then a different source, then you want to go back and cite the first work again, you use the short form. The short form looks like this:

Last name of author, page number.

So, if, after citing Mendes-Flohr's book on German Jews, I then cited a different work for my second footnote, but on my third footnote I wanted to cite Mendes-Flohr's book on German Jews again, page 16, I would enter the following for footnote number three:

Mendes-Flohr, 16.

5. If, however, there is more than one work by that author that you are using or that you have in your bibliography, you must go beyond simply using the author's last name, since the reader won't know to which work you are referring. You must also give a shortened version of the title. This varies from title to title and is up to your discretion, but the idea is to give the shortest possible version of the title that will still convey which book it is. So for the title *German Jews: A Dual Identity* you would most likely write simply *German Jews*. Thus, if you are using both works by Mendes-Flohr, as you will in your first writing assignment, you will enter for your shortened form:

Mendes-Flohr, *German Jews*, 16.

6. If you are not citing from a book that is written *by* someone or a group of people, but instead you are citing from an essay or article in an edited volume (which means a book consisting of essays by other authors, or collections of primary source documents), your full form citation will look like this:

Name of essay or document author, "Title of Essay or Document," the word "in" and then the name of the editor or editors followed by the abbreviation ed., or eds., then the *Name of the Whole Volume*, then the (place of publication: name of press) year of publication, pages in the volume, page you are citing.

So, to cite for the first time the essay about the "Genesis of the Final Solution" by Detlev Peukert in the volume *Reevaluating the Third Reich* edited by Jane Caplan and Thomas Childers, page 235, you would write in the footnote:

Detlev Peukert, "The Genesis of the 'Final Solution' from the Spirit of Science" in *Reevaluating the Third Reich*, Jane Caplan and Thomas Childers, eds., 234-252, 235.

The next time you cite it non-consecutively, that is, when you use the short form, it simply the last name of the author and the shortened version of the title using quotes, not italics and the page, like this:

Peukert, "Spirit of Science," 235.

7. When you are citing from a journal article, the full form looks like this:

Name of Author, "Title of Article," the word "in" *the Name of the Journal*, the volume number, the abbreviation "no." for number and then the issue number, the page numbers of the article, and the page you are citing.

It looks like this:

Robert Vivarelli, "Interpretations on the Origins of Fascism" in *The Journal of Modern History* 63, no. 1, 29-43, 40.

The short form is the same as for an essay in an edited volume:

Vivarelli, "Origins of Fascism," 33.

8. What to cite and what not to cite

    a. You cite everything you quote. You should not, however, quote everything you cite. You should only rarely quote secondary sources. The only time you would do this is if another author has used phrasing or terminology that is unique and important to your point in of itself—so that the reader of your paper *must* read the other author's words word-for-word to understand the point you are trying to make. Otherwise, paraphrase and cite. For primary sources, it is still up to you whether to paraphrase or quote directly, though if you quote directly, it must be a relevant quote and not just filler.

    b. Do not cite the dictionary. Do not cite the dictionary. Do not cite the dictionary. The only conceivable time you would cite a dictionary is in the case of thematically organized dictionaries, like *The Oxford Dictionary of Fascism* which is really a reference guide to terminology about Fascism and Nazism, not "the dictionary." But even here, this kind of reference work should only be used infrequently and never as one of your required secondary sources.

    c. Do not cite websites. You can use websites to help fill you in on details or get ideas, of course. Wikipedia is great for getting started or getting a nice overview or general idea of a subject. But it is not a source in of itself. Only in rare cases is this acceptable, and I will use my discretion as to whether to accept it as a real source.

d. You must cite any source you use no matter what it is. There are formats for citing DVDs, works of art, poems, government documents, archival documents, interviews, television shows, podcasts, you tube videos—anything and everything *can* be a source. If it becomes necessary to cite something unorthodox like this, use your best judgment, following the basic rule of citation mentioned at the top.

e. You may cite class lectures, but not as one of your required sources. If your narrative seems to be repeating lecture material very closely and in large volume, that is okay, but you need to cite it. The format for citing lecture is this:

Eli Rubin, lecture, 5-13-10.

The format here is not super important, because this is very specific to this class and not something that you will need to carry over to other situations.